

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

un

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/27/2001 09/963,466 Tsutomu Tamaki 030675-063 9568 EXAMINER BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P. LEE, BENNY T P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 2817

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		FRIE OF ST	Address : COM Wes	MISSIONER OF PAT hington, D.C. 20231	ENTS AND TRADEMARKS
· esta	FILING DATE	H851	MARKED HAVENYOR		ALLOSAEA DOCKEL NO
	the second section at the second		and areas are a series		
				, i	EXAMINED
				1	i i
				graph and a community over 1 feet of all 10	Annual of the second se
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			J. Park		
			·F .	DATE MAILER	
Desired to the second	From the examinar in the	rgs of year application.			1
-					
This application to	s been examined. [7	Responsive to communic	estion filed on 16 S	ot 2003	This action is made final.
	/	is action is set to expire	month(s),	M	the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within	n the period for respon	se will cause the applicatio	n to become abandon	ed. 35 U.S.C. 133	
Part THE FOLLOW	ING ATTACHMENT(S)	ARE PART OF THIS ACT	non:		
Notice of B	eterences Cited by Exa	miner PTO-892	2. Notice	e re Patent Drawing, I	PTO-948.
3. D Notice of A	rt Cited by Applicant, P	TO-1449.			pplication, Form PTO-152
5. Information	on How to Effect Draw	ing Changes, PTO-1474.	6,		
Part II SUMMARY C	F ACTION			-	
1. Z Claims		1-17			are pending in the application
<i></i>		3-14			
Of th	ne above, claims			a	re withdrawn from consideration
2. Claims			-		have been cancelled, .
3. Claims					are allowed.
4. Z Claims	1, 7	, 15-17			are rejected.
$\mathcal{L}$		<del>/</del>			-
5. L.J Claims					are objected to.
6. 2 Claims		1-11	<del></del>	are subject to restric	ion or election requirement.
7. This applica	ation has been filed with	n intormal drawings under :	37 C.F.R. 1.85 which	are acceptable for exa	mination purposes.
8. Formal draw	wings are required in re	sponse to this Office action	1.		
9. The correct	ed or substitute drawin	gs have been received on		Und	or 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawing
ere 🗋 ac	ceptable; 🛘 not accep	t to notenesque eea) eldato	totice re Patent Drawi	ng, PTO-948).	
		tute sheet(s) of drawings, fi		has (have) been	☐ approved by the
		examiner (see explanation	).	:	e de la companya de l
11. The propos	ed drawing correction,	filed	has been D app	roved; 🗖 disapprove	d (see explanation).
	gement is made of the c so in parent application,	daim for priority under U.S	.C. 119. The certilied	copy has ☐ been re	beviecen need ton 🔲 beviec
. —			1.		
		be in condition for allowand r Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.		attere, prosecution as	to the ments is closed in
14, DOther					.:
int Cale					
		Υ'			
		. 8			
20				125	
	•		78	4	÷ .
		2.	Y .	0.5	
,		EXAMINE	r'S ACTION		
PTOL-325 (Rev.9-89)		SN	963466		
e te Tua		U.S.GPO:19	90-259-282		
ut-				Q	

Art Unit: 2817

Claims 3-14 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in Paper No. 8.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Note that explicit detail descriptions of Fig. 8B should be respectively provided (e.g. including reference labels L1, L2, etc). Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Ulian et al.

Ulian et al (Figs. 3a, 3b) disclose top and bottom substrates (30, 32), each of which comprises a circular region therein characterized as a "waveguide terminal" (especially when the region is arranged in conjunction with strip conductors (34, 36, 38) to define a waveguiding structure). Note that a "contact region" (i.e. 44, 44') is associated with the respective substrate and surrounds the corresponding circular region and electrically grounds a portion of the circular regions. An interconnect or "joint" member comprising solder points (60, 62<sub>1</sub>, 62<sub>2</sub>, ...) are

Art Unit: 2817

arranged to "bond" or join together the substrates (30, 32) across the opposing contact regions by being sandwiched therebetween to thereby form to form a unitary connected structure.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ulian et al.

Ulian et al discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, in which the substrates (30, 32) are "bonded" to each other by soldering at solder points (60; 62<sub>1</sub>, 62<sub>2</sub>, ...), but does not disclose bonding of the substrates by conductive adhesive or thermocompression bonding.

Note that in figs. 2a, 2b, an alternative connecting joint member (50) is provided. Accordingly, in view of this alternative structure, obviously one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that such a structure would needed to have been bonded to substrates (30, 32) to provide a secured unitary structure. Therefore, in using such an embodiment as an alternative to the solder point arrangement, this would have suggested that any equivalent type of bonding (e.g. adhesive, thermal compression, etc) would have been usable therewith.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 15-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2817

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benny Lee whose telephone number is (703) 308 4902.

BENNY T. LEE PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 2817

B. Lee

November 26, 2003